

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-26 are pending in the present application.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-8, 11-16, and 18-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Whitmire et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,167,403, hereinafter Whitmire) in view of Singh et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,758,083; hereinafter Singh); and Claims 9, 10, 17, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Whitmire in view of Singh, and further in view of Compliment et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,360,260, hereinafter Compliment).

The continuation sheet of the Advisory Action mailed on October 25, 2005 states that Singh discloses the claimed “customizing a trap for use as a custom trap, said step of customizing including selecting device attributes and thresholds using a graphic user interface” because Singh discloses “if someone has the authority to change, add, delete, etc. a trap that is [pre-defined] is definitely customizing the trap because they are modifying, or making or building the trap to their individual specifications or preference.” Applicants respectfully traverse this position.

Singh does not teach or suggest the claimed “customizing a trap for use as a custom trap, said step of customizing including selecting device attributes and thresholds using a graphic user interface.” Singh does not disclose or suggest that someone has the authority to change, add, delete, etc. a trap. The outstanding Office Action and the continuation sheet of the advisory action rely on col. 14, lines 39-65 of Singh. Col. 14, lines 39-65 of Singh merely discloses 6 predefined traps; some with names such as add, delete, and change. These are not custom traps. These traps were not created by selecting device attributes and thresholds using a graphic user interface.

“Add,” “create,” “change,” and “delete” are types of traps that are only coincidentally named “add,” “create,” “change,” and “delete.”¹ The outstanding Office Action and Advisory Action do not argue that a trap named “background” allows someone to have the authority to “background a trap.”

Singh further states that NM database traps, the 6 traps described at col. 14, lines 39-65 of Singh, “occur when adding a new element to the database or when some attributes of an element change or when an element is deleted.”² The traps themselves are not customized or changed in any way. The traps merely occur or are triggered when an element changes or when an element is deleted.

Singh includes descriptions of the 6 traps, which describes when the trap is generated (i.e. when the trap occurs). The predefined trap “add” is generated when a new element is added to the database.³ The predefined trap “create” is generated when a new element is created.⁴ The predefined trap “change” is generated when attributes of the element (such as the agents list or the screen coordinates) are changed. The predefined trap “delete” is generated when an element is deleted from the database.⁵ The predefined trap “background” is generated when a background image is added to a view.⁶ The predefined trap “load” is generated when a new management database is loaded.⁷

None of these 6 traps describes a change to any trap. The 6 traps are generated or triggered when there is a change to a database, a view, or an element.

¹ Singh, col. 14, lines 45-46. Singh states “... each type of trap (i.e. add, create, change, delete, load and background).” (Emphasis added).

² Singh, col. 6, lines 60-63.

³ Singh, col. 14, lines 51-53.

⁴ Singh, col. 14, lines 56-57.

⁵ Singh, col. 14, lines 62-63.

⁶ Singh, col. 14, lines 54-55.

⁷ Singh, col. 14, lines 64-65.

Furthermore, Singh discloses that a GUI is used to configure a sender and receiver processes of the network management system.⁸ Singh further states “the GUI would allow the user to easily define the following: (i) the list of remote receiving stations authorized to register with the local sender process and the databases that the receiving stations are authorized to access, (ii) filter files and database templates that determine the event and topology information forwarded by the sender process, and (iii) the list of remote management stations the receiver process will attempt to register within the database instance and the filter file that it will request at the sending station.”⁹ Singh does not describe or suggest that the GUI is used to customize a trap for use as a custom trap.

The outstanding Office Action acknowledges that Whitmire does not disclose the claimed “customizing a trap.” Compliment does not cure the deficiencies of Whitmire and Singh. Compliment describes registering an SNMP device and does not describe or suggest “customizing a trap.”

In view of the above-noted distinctions, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 1 (and dependent Claims 2-10) patentably distinguish over Whitmire, Singh, and Compliment, alone or in combination. Applicants also submit that independent Claims 11 and 18 (and dependent Claims 12-17 and 19-26) patentably distinguish over Whitmire, Singh, and Compliment, alone or in combination, for at least the reasons given for Claim 1.

Moreover, dependent Claims 5-7, 13-15, and 21-23 further patentably distinguish over Whitmire, Singh, and Compliment.

Claim 5 recites “receiving user input defining the custom trap, wherein the user input specifies an attribute of the selected device and a value for the triggering condition.” Claims 13 and 21 are similar to Claim 5. The outstanding Office Action states that Whitmire does

⁸ Singh, col. 15, lines 47-49.

⁹ Singh, col. 15, lines 51-60.

Application No. 10/002,693
Reply to Office Action of June 22, 2005

not disclose customizing a trap.¹⁰ However, the outstanding Office Action relies only on Whitmire to describe the subject matter of Claims 5, 13, and 21, which further define customizing a trap. The outstanding Office Action takes an illogical position that Whitmire fails to disclose customizing a trap, but does discloses receiving user input defining the custom trap.

Claims 6, 7, 14, 15, 21 and 22 also include additional elements defining a custom trap. Again, the outstanding Office Action only relies on Whitmire, which by the Office Actions own admission does not disclose customizing a trap.

Singh and Compliment do not disclose customizing a trap, and thus do not disclose Claims 5-7, 13-15, and 20-22, which further define customizing a trap.

Thus, in view of the above-noted distinctions, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent Claims 5-7, 13-15, and 20-22 further patentably distinguish over Whitmire, Singh, and Compliment.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Michael E. Monaco
Registration No. 52,041

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

I:\ATTY\JW\263552US\263552US_AM DUE 11-22-05.DOC

¹⁰ Office Action, mailed June 22, 2005, page 3.